



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,400	06/18/2001	Heung-For Cheng	42390P11056	2295

8791 7590 11/05/2003

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

ZHEN, LI B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/884,400

Applicant(s)

CHENG ET AL.

Examiner

Li B. Zhen

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 11 – 13, 15, 17 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,592,664 to Starkey.

As to claim 1, Starkey teaches obtaining exclusive use of a system event log [acquiring exclusive control of the event table; col. 15, lines 40 – 50; col. 16, lines 12 – 21 and 43 – 67] in a host system [database management system; col. 6, lines 20 – 67] from one [application or process] or more system management applications [interface converts certain high-level commands from an application or process; col. 7, lines 1 – 8], obtaining an identifier [EVENT NAME provide a unique identification for each event; col. 8, lines 56 – 57] corresponding to an unprocessed record [event manager points to the next position in the event queue message; col. 22, lines 20 – 30], and determining the next unprocessed record [if that decoding pointer is pointing at another event name, the event manager...process the next event name; col. 22, lines 20 – 30].

As to claim 15, Starkey teaches exclusive use of a system event log [acquiring exclusive control of the event table; col. 15, lines 40 – 50; col. 16, lines 12 – 21 and 43 – 67];

Art Unit: 2126

receiving a request for the exclusive use of a system event log in a host system from one of one or more system management applications [FIG. 11 discloses the sequence for acquiring exclusive control...when the initializing sequence in FIG. 10 calls this acquisition sequence in step 167, the event manager 24 increments the acquire_count variable (step 170) that normally will have a zero value; col. 15, lines 40 - 50; col. 16, lines 53 - 67];

granting exclusive use of the system event log to the requesting system management application if no other system management application maintains a lock [acquire_count variable] on the system event log [if the incremented value of the acquire_count variable equals 1, no other process has exclusive control, so the event manager 24 branches (step 171) and tries to assume exclusive control, Fig. 11; col. 16, line 56 - col. 17, line 15]; and

denying use of the system event log to the requesting system management application if another application maintains a lock on the system event log [operations return to the controlling routine that now denies access to the shared memory to any other process; col. 17, lines 1 - 15].

As to claim 11, Starkey teaches processing the unprocessed record [if that decoding pointer is pointing at another event name, the event manager...process the next event name; col. 22, lines 20 - 30], and releasing exclusive use of the system event log [relinquishing exclusive control of the event table, Fig. 12; col. 17, lines 15 - 31].

As to claim 12, Starkey teaches determining if there are additional records to process [when all the event names have been processed, the event manager 24 uses step 252 to determine whether the post flag is TRUE; col. 22, lines 20 – 30]

As to claim 13, Starkey teaches storing the identifier corresponding to the unprocessed record in non-volatile memory [event manager points to the next position in the event queue message; col. 22, lines 20 – 30].

As to claim 17, Starkey teaches determining if exclusive use of the system event log is locked by another application [If the incremented value of the acquire_count variable equals 1, no other process has exclusive control...If the acquire_count variable is greater than 1, the process already has exclusive control; col. 16, line 56 – col. 17, line 15].

As to claim 21, Starkey teaches receiving a request to release the lock on the exclusive use of the system event log in the host system from a system management application [when the event manager 24 completes the task that requires exclusive control over the event table, it relinquishes control; col. 17, lines 15 – 31], and releasing the lock on the exclusive use of the system event log [relinquishing exclusive control of the event table, Fig. 12; col. 17, lines 15 – 31].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2 – 10, 14, 16, 18 – 20, and 22 – 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Intelligent Platform Management Interface Specification v1.0” (p. 1 – 13, 23, 69 and 93 – 103; hereinafter “IPMI1.0”) in view of Starkey.

As to claim 22, IPMI1.0 teaches an Intelligent Platform Management Interface [p. 1, Section 1. Introduction; p. 9, Section 1.5.15], requesting access to a IPMI system event log [System Management Software can access the System Event log; p. 23, Section 5.5; p. 93, Section 18], and requesting an unprocessed system event [Next SEL Record ID; p. 97, Section 18.5]. IPMI1.0 does not specify requesting and releasing exclusive use of the system event log.

However, Starkey teaches requesting [acquiring exclusive control of the event table, Fig. 11; col. 15, lines 40 – 50; col. 16, lines 12 – 21 and 43 – 67] and releasing exclusive use [relinquishing exclusive control of the event table, Fig. 12; col. 17, lines 15 – 31] of a system event log [event table].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of requesting and releasing exclusive use of the system event log as taught by Starkey to the system of IPMI1.0 because this provides concurrency control and ensures data integrity for the event log [col. 16, lines 47 – 51 of Starkey].

As to claim 25, IPMI1.0 teaches Intelligent Platform Management Interface [p. 1, Section 1. Introduction; p. 9, Section 1.5.15], and requesting access to a IPMI system event log [System Management Software can access the System Event log; p. 23, Section 5.5; p. 93, Section 18]. As to synchronize the exclusive access to a system

event log and access the system event log only if exclusive access to the system event Log was granted, see the rejections to claims 15 and 22.

As to claims 2 and 16, see the rejection to claim 22.

As to claim 3, IPMI1.0 as modified teaches the unprocessed record [Next SEL Record ID; p. 97, Section 18.5 of IPMI1.0] is a record of an IPMI event [SEL Event Records; p. 101, Sections 19 and 19.1 of IPMI1.0].

As to claims 4 and 26, IPMI1.0 as modified teaches requesting exclusive use of the system event log [acquiring exclusive control of the event table, Fig. 11; col. 15, lines 40 – 50; col. 16, lines 12 – 21 and 43 – 67 of Starkey], and receiving an acknowledgement that exclusive use is granted [if the incremented value of the acquire_count variable equals 1, no other process has exclusive control, so the event manager 24 branches (step 171) and tries to assume exclusive control, Fig. 11; col. 16, line 56 - col. 17, line 15 of Starkey].

As to claims 5 and 29, IPMI1.0 as modified teaches accessing the Intelligent Platform Management Interface Last Software Process Event ID storage location [GET LAST ENTRY, Table 18-5; p. 97, Section 18.5 of IPMI1.0].

As to claims 6 and 7, IPMI1.0 as modified teaches issuing a lock request to a lock agent application [event manager] that runs on the host system [if the incremented value of the acquire_count variable equals 1, no other process has exclusive control, so the event manager 24 branches (step 171) and tries to assume exclusive control, Fig. 11; col. 16, line 56 - col. 17, line 15 of Starkey].

As to claims 8 – 10 and 18 – 20, IPMI1.0 as modified teaches the one or more system management applications include out-of-band system management applications [out-of-band applications; p. 69, Section 13.6; p. 103, Section 20 of IPMI1.0] and in-band system management applications [in-band access to the IPMI management information; p. 4, Section 1.5.2; p. 5, Fig. 1-1 of IPMI1.0].

As to claim 14, IPMI1.0 as modified teaches storing the identifier corresponding to the unprocessed record in the Intelligent Platform Management Interface Last Software Process Event ID storage location [records are added on after the last record in the SEL; p. 97, Section 18.6 of IPMI1.0].

As to claim 23, IPMI1.0 as modified teaches the IPMI system event log [SEL Event Records; p. 101, Sections 19 and 19.1 of IPMI1.0] is on a server unit configured to run IPMI [p. 1, Section 1. Introduction; p. 9, Section 1.5.15 of IPMI1.0].

As to claim 24, see the rejection to claim 11.

As to claim 27, IPMI1.0 as modified teaches retrieving a last processed event before retrieving a next unprocessed event [if that decoding pointer is pointing at another event name, the event manager...process the next event name; col. 22, lines 20 – 30 of Starkey].

As to claim 28, IPMI1.0 as modified teaches revoke the exclusive use of the system event log [relinquishing exclusive control of the event table, Fig. 12; col. 17, lines 15 – 31 of Starkey].

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Li B. Zhen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3406. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Li B. Zhen
Examiner
Art Unit 2126

lbz
October 30, 2003



**JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**